

EIA-Funded Program Name:

*** Current Fiscal Year EIA Allocation to this EIA-Program:**

*** Name of Person Completing Survey and to whom EOC members may request additional information:**

*** Telephone number:**

*** E-mail:**

History of the program. Please mark the appropriate response (choose one):This program:

Was an original initiative of the Education Improvement Act of 1984

Was created or implemented as part of the Education Accountability Act of 1998

Has been operational for less than five years

Was funded by last fiscal year by general or other funds.

Is a new program implemented for the first time in the current fiscal year

Other

What SC laws, including provisos in the current year's general appropriation act, govern the implementation of this program? Provide complete citations from the SC Code of Laws including Title, Chapter, and Section numbers.

Title 59-18-300

Code of Laws:(MAX. 100 characters)

None exists. WIN has line item appropriation only.

Proviso Number:(MAX: 100 characters)

None exists. WIN has line item appropriation only.

What South Carolina regulations govern the implementation of this program? Provide specific references to the South Carolina Code of Regulations?

Regulations:

None exists. WIN has line item appropriation only.

Do guidelines that have been approved by the State Board of Education, the Commission on higher Education or other governing board exist that govern the implementation of this program?

Yes

No

What are the primary objective(s) or goals of this program? Please distinguish between the long-term mission of the program and the current annual objectives of the program. (The goals or objectives should be in terms that can be quantified, evaluated and assessed.) (MAX 3500 characters)

The Writing Improvement Network (WIN) serves as a professional development resource for South Carolina (SC) K-12 teachers. WIN uses teacher experts to provide training in the implementation of research-based best practices in teaching students to become better readers and writers and provides guidance in choosing professional development and classroom resources. WIN's objectives are to 1) inform SC's public schools of WIN's purposes and activities; 2) become involved with other education-related agencies and projects that affect English Language Arts (ELA) instruction; 3) develop a technical assistance plan that focuses on ELA academic standards of greatest need by analyzing available data; 4) collaborate with teachers to develop instructional strategies and materials to improve ELA instruction for all students with emphasis on ?underperforming schools? (determined by SC's annual report card); and 5) provide professional development based on current research.

In the prior fiscal year, what primary program activities or processes were conducted to facilitate the program's performance in reaching the objective(s) as provided in question 7? What, if any, change in processes or activities are planned for the current fiscal year? (Examples of program processes would be: training provided, recruiting efforts made, technical assistance services, monitoring services, etc. Answers should be specific to the process undertaken at the state level to support the objectives of the program and should be quantifiable Please include any professional development services provided.)(MAX: 5000 characters)

Primary goals: In the prior fiscal year, WIN

1. provided school-level assistance to content area teachers to meet students' writing and reading needs;
2. provided teacher training to address the writing components of the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT), American College Testing Program (ACT), Palmetto Achievement Challenge Tests (PACT), and High School Assessment Program (HSAP);
3. provided both regional and onsite technical assistance to elementary and middle schools that did not meet standard based on 2006 PACT scores;
4. provided both regional and onsite technical assistance to high schools that did not meet standard based on 2006 HSAP scores;
5. established Learning Initiative Awards (LIA) to replace Exemplary Writing Program; and
6. offered 2006 Fall Writing Conference.

Primary goals: In the current fiscal year, WIN will

1. collaborate with the SDE to provide standards implementation workshops for teachers;
2. provide school-level technical assistance and district-level scoring academies by request;
3. include sessions on SC's testing programs at the Fall Writing Conference;
4. provide technical assistance and instructional materials to schools that did not meet standard based on 2007 PACT and HSAP scores;
5. offer the Learning Initiative Award (LIA) to schools meeting the point criteria;
6. offer the 2007 Fall Writing Conference and ensure that the program provides information for all educational levels (K-12 and college); and
7. promote its services through brochures, its web site, and professional development services in collaboration with the South Carolina Department of Education (SDE).

In the prior fiscal year and using the most recent data available, what were the direct products and services (outputs) delivered by this program? (Examples of program outputs would be: number of teachers attending professional development seminars, number of AP exams given and students taking AP classes, number of students served in the program, etc.)(MAX: 5000 characters)

1. Services to content area teachers: WIN focused on writing and reading in all school-level professional development conducted. Scoring academies also focused on helping teachers evaluate student work to meet students' needs. Descriptions of these programs are provided below.
WIN Scoring Academy: WIN conducted two scoring academies: Chesterfield Co. for grade 4 only in fall (Oct) and winter (Feb) with four onsite professional development days and Sumter 17 for grades 6-8 in the fall (Oct) with two professional development days for Alice Drive Middle and Bates Middle. Teachers learned to use the SC 15-point rubric to score their students' papers online at the Learning Effects secure site, learned instructional strategies, and received materials to address weaknesses seen in student responses. Chesterfield teachers scored 1,103 grade 4 students' papers (fall, 560; winter, 543); and Sumter 17 teachers scored 1,408 students' papers (grade 6, 479; grade 7, 445; grade 8, 484). Student reports were available within 10 days.
Professional Development Sessions by Request: Clarendon 2 requested eight onsite professional development sessions with two consultants per session for each of Manning Primary, Elementary, and Jr. High Schools.

2. Training for the SAT, ACT, PACT, and HSAP writing: 2006 Fall Writing Conference: In addition to traditional reading and writing sessions, sessions relating reading and writing with math, science, and social studies were offered. Dr. Harriett Williams, USC, presented "What Do We Need to Know about the SAT's Writing Sample." Bill Pell, Spartanburg High School, retired, presented "Strategies for Critical Reading and Writing Sessions of the PSAT/SAT." Twelve other high school sessions were offered.
Other Assistance: WIN provided assistance to a number of primary, elementary, and middle schools which establishes a good foundation to prepare students for HSAP, SAT, and ACT.

3. Services to elementary and middle schools not meeting 2006 PACT standard
Professional Development Regional Sessions for 2006-2007: WIN and the Office of School Quality collaborated to provide four regional sessions for teachers from 27 schools with "Unsatisfactory" and "Below Average" Absolute Report Card ratings. SDE staff analyzed data from 2003-2006 PACT and the 2005-06 Benchmark assessments and identified six ELA areas of weakness. These areas became the content focus of these regional sessions as described below.
September Sessions: figurative language "irony, inference, main idea
November Sessions: elements of style, inference, main idea
January Sessions: point of view, elements of style, inference, main idea
March Sessions: vocabulary development, inference
WIN served all "Unsatisfactory" schools that requested assistance.
Onsite Professional Development: Of the 27 schools attending these sessions, 12 schools from 12 districts each received six onsite professional development sessions.

4. Services to high schools not meeting 2006 HSAP standard: Six "Unsatisfactory" high schools attended WIN's professional development regional sessions in 2006-2007. Allendale-Fairfax High attended all four regional sessions and received six onsite professional development sessions. Onsite sessions focused on the same six ELA standards identified by PACT data; however, instructional rigor and materials were modified for use with high school students. Chesterfield Central High and CA Johnson School attended all four regional sessions; R B Stall High and Creek Bridge High attended three; and Denmark-Olar High attended one.

5. Learning Initiative Awards (LIA) to replace Exemplary Writing Program: WIN initiated a new program to recognize schools participating in the WIN-SDE sessions. Criteria were those proven to increase/enhance the learning environment in schools. The awards and their respective points are Gold Medal Award (220-235 points), Silver Medal Award (204-219 points), Bronze Medal Award (188-203 points). All winner

What are the outcomes or results of this program? (Program outcomes can be both quantitative and qualitative and should address the program's objectives. Please use the most recent data available. Examples of outcomes would be: results of surveys, test data, increase in minority participation, reduction in achievement gaps, teacher loans awarded, textbooks purchased, etc.)(MAX: 5000 characters)

1.Services to content area teachers: WIN Scoring Academy: Seventeen Chesterfield Co teachers (7 schools) and eleven Sumter 17 teachers (2 schools) completed the project survey. Using a Likert scale ranging from Strongly Agree (1) to Strongly Disagree (5), teachers responded to statements about the project and the potential impact on instruction. Teachers also responded to open-ended questions. Percentages responding positively (Strongly Agree and Agree ratings combined) are presented in Table 1.(INSERT TABLE 1 HERE.)Chesterfield Co ratings ranged from 82.35% to 100.00%, indicating a positive experience for teachers. Responses to open-ended questions indicated excellent strategies and trainer, and limit papers scored. Sumter 17 ratings ranged from 50.5% to 72.73%. Because ratings for the two Sumter 17 schools attending the same academy were so different, data were disaggregated. Ratings for Bates ranged from 27.27% to 100%, while ratings for Alice Drive ranged from 0.0% to 50.0%. The two lowest ratings at Alice Drive indicated additional strategies were needed and the 6+1 Traits of Writing book was not received when, in fact, WIN gave each teacher a book. Comments from Bates were resources should be listed and it was a wonderful workshop. Alice Drive teachers were openly hostile and resistant during training. One Alice Drive teacher asked, "You mean this program doesn't grade the papers? Then what good is it?" Obviously, the teacher missed the training's purpose. Professional Development Sessions by Request: Percentages meeting standard increased from 2006 to 2007 for two of three Manning schools receiving eight onsite sessions. (INSERT TABLE 2 HERE.)

2.Training on SAT, ACT, PACT, and HSAP writing: Although SAT and HSAP sessions were offered at the 2006 Fall Writing Conference, data are not available to show that attending the sessions improved performance on the SAT or ACT. However, survey comments stated that SAT writing strategies were helpful. As of this report due date, 2007 HSAP data are not available.

3.Services to elementary and middle schools not meeting 2006 PACT standard: The Office of School Quality and WIN collaborated to provide professional development to elementary and middle schools receiving "Unsatisfactory" and "Below Average" Absolute Report Card ratings. Thirteen "Unsatisfactory" and 14 "Below Average" schools participated. Of these 27 schools, twelve participated in four regional sessions and received six onsite visits from WIN, and fifteen participated in regional sessions only. To establish the focus of the 2006-07 sessions, SDE staff analyzed data from the 2003-2006 ELA PACT and 2005-06 Benchmark assessments for areas of weakness. Items on which students performed poorly aligned to the standards of figurative language, point of view, main idea, elements of style, inference, and vocabulary. To determine WIN's effectiveness, a matched sample of students was drawn from the group of schools receiving WIN's services (WIN) and the group not receiving WIN's services (Non-WIN). Only 45th day students with test scores for both 2006 and 2007 were included in the analysis. For each grade level analysis, performance on items aligned to the six focus standards were summed. N's, means, and one-way analyses of variance results are provided in Table 2.(INSERT TABLE 3 HERE.) Results for the F-tests show students in five of six grades in schools receiving WIN's services (WIN) scored significantly higher on the focus standards than students in schools which did not receive WIN's services. Results indicate that WIN's services contributed to improved performance on the six focus standards.

4.Services to high schools not meeting 2006 HSAP standard: Of six high schools participating in regional sessions, only Allendale-Fairfax High chose to receive six onsite visits. As of this report due date, 2007 HSAP data are not available.

5.Learning Initiative Awards (LIA): Gold Winners were Starr Iva Middle, Fairfield Intermedi

Program Evaluations

What was the date of the last external or internal evaluation of this program?

Has an evaluation been conducted?

Yes No

**If an evaluation was conducted, what were the results and primary recommendations of the evaluation?
(MAX: 2000 characters)**

1. Maintain WIN professional staff at current levels. Demand for WIN's services remains high, and as the new state testing instrument is developed it is likely that WIN's services will be needed to assist schools in understanding the instrument and adjusting curricula to its requirements, as well as continuing to meet present needs.

2. Continue future WIN services with the emerging new state instrument.

3. Expand the reach and service provided by the AdNet. Although state administrators are becoming increasingly better informed about the best practice in teaching of writing, many still do not know what resources are available or how to best adapt resources to their local needs. Leadership plays an important part in the reform of curriculum, and leadership cannot exist in the absence of information.

4. Expand the WIN homepage on the Internet to include the following: a) online registration and hotel reservation forms for WIN conference; b) an online version for South Carolina Writing Teacher: c) press release and news of interest to the profession; d) links to related sites on the World Wide Web, for example, those maintained by the South Carolina Department of Education, the National Writing Project, the National Council of Teachers of English, National Public Radio, South Carolina Educational Television, etc.; and e) a "Dear WIN" email link for teachers, administrators, and students who have questions about WIN and its services.

5. Where appropriate, disseminate exemplary district curriculum guides and similar documents that might be of interest and/or use to schools throughout the state. This might be accomplished through the WIN site on the World Wide Web, for example.

Can you provide a URL link, electronic version or hard copy of this evaluation to the Education Oversight Committee?

Yes

No

If no, why not?(MAX: 100 characters)

Can provide hard copy.

The following questions do NOT apply to programs having a program code beginning with 01. (These are programs administered by or through the Department of Education. The Office of Finance at the Department of Education will provide answers to these questions.) If your program code begins with 01, please hit the NEXT button below. Once you advance to the next page, hit the SUBMIT button.

Please mark the appropriate response:

The total amount of EIA funds requested for this program for the next fiscal year will be:

The same as appropriated in the current fiscal year's appropriation

An increase over the current fiscal year's appropriation

A decrease over the current fiscal year's appropriation

If you indicated an increase or decrease in funding for the next fiscal year, what is the total amount requested for this program for the next fiscal year?

If you indicated an increase or decrease, please describe the reasons for the increase or decrease. How will the increase or decrease impact the objectives of the program as answered in question 7?(MAX: 3500 characters)

WIN will devote 100% of its funds to professional development. To better fulfill its mission to improve student achievement, WIN will focus 75% of its resources on schools identified as 1520 schools whose Absolute Report Card ratings are ?Unsatisfactory? or ?Below Average.? WIN will continue to sponsor and coordinate the Fall Writing Conference and the WIN-Learning Effects Scoring Academy. ?Unsatisfactory? and ?Below Average? schools to be served by WIN will be identified by the Office of Instructional Promising Practices. However, given WIN's lack of staffing and insufficient funds, WIN will be able to provide onsite assistance only to approximately 10 districts and 12 schools identified by the SDE to receive services. WIN needs additional funding to purchase materials to provide to the ?Unsatisfactory? and ?Below Average? schools. WIN currently has a director, one support staff, and one professional staff member. Without additional FTE funding WIN has to rely almost totally on part-time consultants which are very costly. Consultants are not always available when WIN needs them and schools with limited funds are not always willing to use their funds to pay for WIN's services. Hence, WIN is requesting funding for four full-time staff content specialists in order to adequately serve and restore its purpose of providing professional development/technical assistance to schools with ?Unsatisfactory? and ?Below Average? ratings. By hiring four full-time staff content specialists rather than four part-time consultants, WIN will have 440 additional days available for onsite visits with underachieving schools and to staff the scoring academies. It is a time-consuming process for the director to locate consultants who might be available when WIN needs them. Having full-time content specialists would also decrease the preparation time for onsite visits. Without the four full-time specialists and with the current funding, the number of onsite visits will be extremely limited. Therefore, large numbers of ?Unsatisfactory? and ?Below Average? schools desperately needing assistance will not be served because of lack of staffing and funding. With four new content specialists and increased funding, WIN would hire two consultants to serve early childhood/elementary schools and two consultants for middle/high schools. WIN also anticipates an increased number of requests for participation in the scoring academies. Two WIN staff are required for each scoring academy. The four new staff will fulfill that need also. Office equipment and supplies will be necessary for new staff. A larger copier will be required to reproduce materials for a greater number of schools. WIN often provides professional texts in schools where they conduct workshops. With increased staff and services and with current cost-of-living expenses escalating, an increase in travel (gas, food, hotel, etc.) funding is much needed. WIN also requires all consultants, both full-time and part-time consultants, to attend state and national conferences to keep abreast of innovations and latest findings in the field. In 2006-07, the WIN director spent \$3,000, including registration fees, to attend two instate conferences and to present at one out-of-state conference. For 2007-2008, the WIN director and five WIN consultants are presenting a day-long workshop at the NCTE in New York, SCCTE in Kiawah, SCIRA in Myrtle Beach. Funds will be needed for travel and registration fees.

Please fill in the attached charts to reflect the budget for this program in the prior fiscal year and the budget for this program in the current fiscal year.

Funding Source	Prior FY Actual	Current FY Estimated
EIA		
General Fund		
Lottery		
Fees		
Other Sources		
Grant		
Contributions, Foundation		
Other (Specify)		
Carry Forward from Prior Yr		
TOTAL		

Expenditures	Prior FY Actual	Current FY Estimated
Personal Service		
Contractual Services		
Supplies and Materials		
Fixed Charges		
Travel		
Equipment		
Employer Contributions		
Allocations to Districts/Schools/Agencies/Entities		
Other: Please explain		
Balance Remaining		
TOTAL		
#FTES		

Data entry complete for this year.

Will additional information (eg. charts, tables, graphs, etc.) be submitted under separate cover to EOC for this program? If so, submit to Melanie Barton at mbarton@eoc.sc.gov. The program number should be cited in the subject of the e-mail.

Yes No